



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/975,896	10/10/2001	Murtaza Chiba	CISCO-4379	1169

7590 07/14/2006

Timothy A. Brisson
Sierra Patent Group
P.O. Box 6149
Stateline, NV 89449

EXAMINER

CHANG, JUNGWON

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

2154

DATE MAILED: 07/14/2006

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/975,896

Applicant(s)

CHIBA ET AL.

Examiner

Jungwon Chang

Art Unit

2154

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 07 April 2006.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-49 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-3,5-7,9-11,13-19,21-24,26-34,36-39,41-44 and 46-48 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☒ Claim(s) 4,8,12,20,25,35,40,45 and 49 is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☐ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____.
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 6) ☐ Other: _____.

FINAL ACTION

1. This Action is in response to amendment filed on 4/7/2006. Claims 1-49 are presented for examination.
2. The objection of Claim 1 is withdrawn in view of amendment.
3. Claims 4, 8, 12, 20, 25, 35, 40, 45 and 49 are objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

4. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.

5. Claims 1, 2, 5, 6, 9, 10, 13, 16-18, 21-23, 26-28, 31-33, 36, 37, 38, 41-43, 46 and 47 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Haverinen et al. (US 2002/0012433), hereinafter Haverine.

6. As to claim 1, Haverine discloses the invention as claimed, including an apparatus for generating an extended-format Vendor Specific Attribute (VSA) packet (page 9, 0214 – page 10, 0237, “Vendor Specific Extension”) comprising:

a RADIUS-compliant server (page 8, 0067-0080, “authentication server” page 16, 0323, “RADIUS protocol”; Remote Authentication Dial-In User service compliant server inherently authenticates subscribers and authorizes subscribers to access the network) for generating a VSA packet (figs. 3-6) including at least a Vendor-Type field (Vendor-Type, figs. 4-6); and

wherein said VSA packet includes a Vendor-Extended-Type field if said Vendor-Type field contains a predetermined value (figs. 4-6; page 9, 0214 – page 10, 0237, “NEW_SESSION_KEY_REQUEST_VENDOR_TYPE...this value indicates that the particular type of this extension is a new session key request extension...the administration of the vendor type is done by the vendor).

7. As to claim 2, Haverine discloses wherein said Vendor-Extended-Type field is 32 bits in length (figs. 3-6; page 8, 0198).

8. As to claims 5 and 46, Haverine discloses a method for generating an extended Vendor Specific Attribute (VSA) (page 9, 0214 – page 10, 0237, “Vendor Specific Extension”) comprising:

determining whether an extended format VSA is desired (page 8, 0190-0193; page 8, 0201 – page 9, 0209);

if an extended format VSA is desired, then generating an extended format VSA containing at least a Vendor-Type field having a predetermined value and a Vendor-Extended-Type field (figs. 4-6; page 9, 0214 – page 10, 0237, “NEW_SESSION_KEY_REQUEST_VENDOR_TYPE...this value indicates that the particular type of this extension is a new session key request extension...the administration of the vendor type is done by the vendor).

9. As to claims 6 and 47, Haverine discloses wherein said Vendor-Extended-Type field is 32 bits in length (figs. 3-6; page 8, 0198).

10. As to claim 9, it is rejected for the same reasons set forth in claim 1 above. In addition, Haverine discloses a program storage device readable by a machine, tangibly embodying a program of instructions executable by the machine to perform a method for generating an extended Vendor Specific Attribute (VSA) (page 5, 0131-0140).

11. As to claim 10, Haverine discloses wherein said Vendor-Extended-Type field is 32 bits in length (figs. 3-6; page 8, 0198).

12. As to claim 13, it is rejected for the same reasons set forth in claim 9 above. In addition, Haverine discloses wherein said Vendor-Extended-Type field is 32 bits in length (figs. 3-6; page 8, 0198).

Art Unit: 2154

13. As to claims 16, 21, 26 and 31, Haverine discloses a method for receiving an extended Vendor Specific Attribute comprising:

determining whether a received packet contains an extended format VSA (page 8, 0190-0193; page 8, 0201 – page 9, 0209);

if said received packet contains an extended format VSA, then reading an extended value contained in a Vendor-Extended-Type field (page 9, 0202); and

if said received packet does not contain an extended format VSA, then processing said received packet as normal (page 9, 0203-0209).

14. As to claims 17, 22, 27 and 32, Haverine discloses wherein said act of determining whether a received packet contains an extended format VSA is performed by examining said received packet to determine whether a Vendor-Type field contains a predetermined value (figs. 4-6; page 9, 0214 – page 10, 0237, “NEW_SESSION_KEY_REQUEST_VENDOR_TYPE...this value indicates that the particular type of this extension is a new session key request extension...the administration of the vendor type is done by the vendor).

15. As to claims 18, 23, 28 and 33, Haverine discloses wherein said Vendor-Extended-Type field is 32 bits in length (figs. 3-6; page 8, 0198).

16. As to claims 36 and 41, they are rejected for the same reasons set forth in claims 16, 21, 26 and 31 above. In addition, Haverine discloses a program storage device

Art Unit: 2154

readable by a machine, tangibly embodying a program of instructions executable by the machine to perform a method for generating an extended Vendor Specific Attribute (VSA) (page 5, 0131-0140).

17. As to claims 37 and 42, Haverine discloses wherein said act of determining whether a received packet contains an extended format VSA is performed by examining said received packet to determine whether a Vendor-Type field contains a predetermined value (figs. 4-6; page 9, 0214 – page 10, 0237, "NEW_SESSION_KEY_REQUEST_VENDOR_TYPE...this value indicates that the particular type of this extension is a new session key request extension...the administration of the vendor type is done by the vendor).

18. As to claims 38 and 43, Haverine discloses wherein said Vendor-Extended-Type field is 32 bits in length (figs. 3-6; page 8, 0198).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

19. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

20. Claims 3, 7, 11, 14, 15, 19, 24, 29, 30, 34, 39, 44 and 48 are rejected under 35

U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Haverinen et al. (US 2002/0012433), hereinafter Haverine, in view of AAPA (Applicant Admitted Prior Art).

21. As to claims 3, 7, 11, 14, 15, 19, 24, 29, 30, 34, 39, 44 and 48, Haverine discloses a VSA packet, which has a field sequence of a type field followed by a Length field followed by a vendor identification field followed by a vendor type field followed by said vendor-extended type field (figs. 3-6). However, Haverine does not specifically disclose an internal length. AAPA discloses an internal length (page 2, lines 3-7, "length of inner value"). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention was made to combine the teachings of Haverine and AAPA because AAPA's internal length field would properly indicate the length of the attribute.

Conclusion

22. Applicant's arguments filed on 4/7/2006 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

(1) The applicant asserts on page 13 of the Remarks that "amended claim 1 recites where said VSA packet includes a Vendor-Extended-Type field if said Vendor-Type field contains a predetermined value." Haverinen does not teach this limitation. The examiner respectfully disagrees. Haverine explicitly discloses VSA packet includes a Vendor-Extended-Type field (subtype, figs. 4-5; page 10, 0230, subtype; page 10, 0231, "vendor specific extension") if said Vendor-Type field contains a predetermined value

Art Unit: 2154

(page 10, 0230, "vendor type: This value indicates that the particular type of this extension is a new session key request extension"). Haverine discloses vendor specific attribute are extended than conventional vendor specific attribute as shown in figs. 4 and 5, therefore, the language of the claims do not have patentably distinguishes them from the references. Furthermore, **independent claim 13** does not have the limitation of "VSA packet includes a Vendor-Extended-Type field if said Vendor-Type field contains a predetermined value."

(2) The applicant asserts on page 15 of the Remarks that if an extended format is desired, then generating an extended format VSA containing at least a Vendor-Type filed having a predetermined value and a Vendor-Extended-Type field." However, Haverinen does not teach this limitation. The examiner respectfully disagrees. Haverine explicitly discloses if an extended format is desired, then generating an extended format VSA containing at least a Vendor-Type filed having a predetermined value and a Vendor-Extended-Type field (subtype, figs. 4-5; page 10, 0230, subtype; page 10, 0231, "vendor specific extension") (page 10, 0230, "vendor type: This value indicates that the particular type of this extension is a new session key request extension"). Haverine discloses vendor specific attribute are extended than conventional vendor specific attribute as shown in figs. 4 and 5, therefore, the language of the claims do not have patentably distinguishes them from the references. Furthermore, **independent claim 13** does not have the limitation of "VSA packet includes a Vendor-Extended-Type field if said Vendor-Type field contains a predetermined value."

(3) Claim 9 is properly rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) for the same reasons cited

above with respect to independent claim 5.

(4) Claim 16 is properly rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) for the same reasons cited above with respect to independent claim 5.

(5) Claim 21 is properly rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) for the same reasons cited above with respect to independent claim 16.

(6) Claim 26 is properly rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) for the same reasons cited above with respect to independent claim 5.

(7) Claim 31 is properly rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) for the same reasons cited above with respect to independent claim 26.

(8) Claim 36 is properly rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) for the same reasons cited above with respect to independent claim 26.

(9) Claim 41 is properly rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) for the same reasons cited above with respect to independent claim 16.

(10) Claim 46 is properly rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) for the same reasons cited above with respect to independent claim 5.

23. **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL.** Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the


Art Unit: 2154

shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

24. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Jungwon Chang whose telephone number is 571-272-3960. The examiner can normally be reached on 9:30-6:00 (Monday-Friday).

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, John A Follansbee can be reached on 571-272-3964. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).



Jungwon Chang
Primary Examiner
July 7, 2006